DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 291 841 UD 026 039

AUTHOR Alexander, Karl L.; And Others
TITLE School Performance, Status Relations, and the Structure of Sentiment: Bringing the Teacher Back In. Report No. 9.
INSTITUTION Center for Research on Elementary and Middle Schools, Baltimore, MD.
SPONS AGENCY Grant (W.T.) Foundation, New York, N.Y.; Office of Educational Research and Improvement (ED), Washington, DC.
PUB DATE Feb 87
GRANT NICHD-1-R01-HD16302; OERI-G-86-0006
NOTE 51p.
PUB TYPE Reports - Research/Technical (143)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC03 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Academic Achievement; *Elementary School Teachers; Expectation; Grade 1; Low Income Groups; Primary Education; Scores; *Social Bias; Social Cognition; *Socioeconomic Status; *Teacher Attitudes; Teacher Background; Teacher Behavior; Teacher Influence; *Teacher Student Relationship; Test Results; Urban Education

ABSTRACT

Previous research has failed to support the widely held assumption that the academic difficulties experienced by many minority and low socioeconomic status youth are due to their "outsider" standing vis-a-vis the middle class culture thought to govern the social relations of schooling. This analysis suggests that this proposition errs in exaggerating the extent of cultural hegemony in the way schools work. Examination of data on the first grade experiences of a diverse sample of 825 urban public school children demonstrates that not all teachers are equally given to status-related biases. In particular, teachers' own social origins exercise a strong influence on how they react to the status attributes of their students. Especially striking are the disadvantages accruing to the low status pupils of high status teachers: their teachers hold to different behavior standards than their parents, consider the pupils to be less mature, hold lower performance expectations for them, and score exceptionally low on a measure of perceived school climate. Year-end marks and standardized test scores of low status students are depressed by these indicators of pupil-teacher social distance and teacher disaffection. A model of pupil-teacher "congruence" or "fit" is proposed as an alternative to the cultural hegemony framework, and the implications of such "fit" for the interpersonal dynamics of the classroom are discussed. Data are presented on four tables. A list of 45 references is included. (Author/BJV)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

3-8-88

Center for Research On Elementary & Middle Schools

ED291841

Report No. 9

February, 1987

SCHOOL PERFORMANCE, STATUS RELATIONS, AND THE STRUCTURE OF SENTIMENT: BRINGING THE TEACHER BACK IN

Karl L. Alexander, Doris R. Entwisle, and Maxine S. Thompson

The Johns Hopkins University

CE052039

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

X This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

2

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

CENTER STAFF

EDWARD L. MCDILL, CO-DIRECTOR

JAMES M. MCPARTLAND, CO-DIRECTOR

KARL L. ALEXANDER

HENRY J. BECKER

BARBARA A. BENNETT

JOMILLS H. BRADDOCK II

BARBARA S. COLTON

RUSSELL L. DAWKINS

DORIS R. ENTWISLE

JOYCE L. EPSTEIN

ANNA MARIE FARNISH

DENISE C. GOTTFREDSON

GARY D. GOTTFREDSON

EDWARD J. HARSCH

JOHN H. HOLLIFIELD

LOIS G. HYBL

NANCY L. KARWEIT

MELVIN L. KOHN

NANCY A. MADDEN

ALEJANDRO PORTES

ROBERT E. SLAVIN

CARLETON W. STERLING

ROBERT J. STEVENS

TAMMI J. SWEENEY

L. THOMAS WEBB

School Performance, Status Relations, and the Structure of Sentiment: Bringing the Teacher Back In

Karl L. Alexander
Johns Hopkins University

Doris R. Entwisle
Johns Hopkins University

Maxine S. Thompson
University of Florida
and
Johns Hopkins University

Report No. 9

February 1987

Published by the Center for Research on Elementary and Middle Schools, supported as a national research and development center by funds from the Office of Educational Research and Improvement, U.S. Department of Education. The opinions expressed in this publication do not necessarily reflect the position or policy of OERI, and no official endorsement should be inferred.

Center for Research on Elementary and Middle Schools
The Johns Hopkins University
3505 North Charles Street
Baltimore MD 21218

Printed and assembled by:
VSP Industries
2440 West Belvedere Avenue
Baltimore MD 21215

The Center

The mission of the Center for Research on Elementary and Middle Schools is to produce useful knowledge about how elementary and middle schools can foster growth in students' learning and development, to develop and evaluate practical methods for improving the effectiveness of elementary and middle schools based on existing and new research findings, and to develop and evaluate specific strategies to help schools implement effective research-based school and classroom practices.

The Center conducts its research in three program areas: (1) Elementary Schools, (2) Middle Schools, and (3) School Improvement.

The Elementary School Program

This program works from a strong existing research base to develop, evaluate, and disseminate effective elementary school and classroom practices; synthesizes current knowledge; and analyzes survey and descriptive data to expand the knowledge base in effective elementary education.

The Middle School Program

This program's research links current knowledge about early adolescence as a stage of human development to school organization and classroom policies and practices for effective middle schools. The major task is to establish a research base to identify specific problem areas and promising practices in middle schools that will contribute to effective policy decisions and the development of effective school and classroom practices.

School Improvement Program

This program focuses on improving the organizational performance of schools in adopting and adapting innovations and developing school capacity for change.

This report, prepared by the Elementary School Program, examines how teacher socioeconomic background affects adjustment in school of minority and low socioeconomic background first-graders.

Abstract

Previous research has failed to support the widely held assumption that the academic difficulties experienced by many minority and low SES youth are due to their "outsider" standing vis-a-vis the middle class culture thought to govern the social relations of schooling. The present analysis suggests that this proposition errs in exaggerating the extent of cultural hegemony in the way schools work. Using data on the first grade experiences of a large, diverse sample of urban public school children, we find that not all teachers are equally given to status-related biases. In particular, teachers' own social origins exercise a strong influence on how they react to the status attributes of their students. Especially striking are the disadvantages accruing to the low status pupils of high status teachers: their teachers hold to different behavior standards than their parents, they are evaluated by their teachers as less mature, their teachers hold lower performance expectations for them, and their teachers score exceptionally low on a measure of perceived school climate. We also find that the year-end marks and standardized test scores of such pupils are depressed by these indicators of pupil-teacher social distance and teacher disaffection. A model of pupil-teacher background "congruence" or "fit" is proposed as an alternative to the cultural hegemony freamework, and the implications of such "fit" for the interpersonal dynamics of the classroom are discussed.

Acknowledgments

This research was supported by NICHD Grant #1 R01 HD16302, by the W.T. Grant Foundation, and by U.S. Office of Education Grant OERI Grant G-86-0006 to the Johns Hopkins University Center for Research on Elementary and Middle Schools.

School Performance, Status Relations, and The Structure of Sentiment: Bringing the Teacher Back In

Although the academic difficulties experienced by many minority and economically disadvantaged youngsters are often attributed to their "outsider status" vis-a-vis the middle class culture that pervades the school, evidence in support of this proposition is actually quite thin. Differences in secondary school performance by social background are trivial for youngsters of similar ability levels (see, for example, Alexander and Eckland, 1980; Rehberg and Rosenthal, 1978; Williams, 1976; Sewell and Hauser, 1980), and on many criterion measures (e.g., college attendance rates, enrollment in a college bound high school program) minority youth often fare better than equally able whites (e.g., Alexander and Cook, 1982; Alexander, Riordan, Fennessey and Pallas, 1982). Youth from high SES backgrounds hold many academic advantages over their less favorably situated peers, but these follow, in the main, from differences of family process (e.g., high levels of parent suppport and the like), rather than school policy or practice.

On the face of it, failure to find socioeconomic disadvantages maintained though school process seems anomalous, at least in light of popular perspectives on the social organization of schooling. While the particulars differ greatly across authors (compare, for example, Bowles and Gintis, 1976, against Bourdieu, 1977), there is broad agreement that schools function both to perpetuate and reproduce the social order. Speaking again in general terms, there are thought to be many points of contact between the schooling process and the broader stratification system (e.g., the sorting, selecting, and gatekeeping functions of schooling), such that the patterns of advantage and disadvantage which prevail in the wider society ought at least be discernible in the way schools work.

Why, then, aren't these patterns apparent in studies designed explicitly to ferret them out? It is possible, we suppose, that the framing of the issues in these studies is askew-- perhaps socioeconomic distinctions do not capture the relevant lines of demarcation. DiMaggio (1982), for example, has shown that youngsters who have been exposed to "high culture," as revealed through their involvement in art, music and literature, tend to do better in school than those who have not. Following Bourdieu (1977), DiMaggio advances a "reproductionist" interpretation, holding that such acquired tastes constitute a form of "cultural capital," whose instrumental, or exchange, value is grounded in the school's institutional role as conservator of the social order. Importantly, these differences of "cultural capital" map but loosely onto socioeconomic differences.

DiMaggio's research reminds us that school processes do not revolve exclusively around the socioeconomic dimension, but nothing in his evidence impugns the longstanding interest in other facets of social background. And others, such as Bowles and Gintis (1976), are quite explicit in according central importance to objective circumstances of the family. Assuming, then, that this interest in socioconomic constraints is not entirely misplaced, we must look elsewhere for the explanation.

A second possibility is that studies cast at the secondary level may simply be looking too far down the road. The literature on teacher expectancy effects, for example, indicates that teachers form impressions about students' potential very early in the schooling process (e.g., Rosenthal and Jacobson, 1968), and that these impressions frequently are grounded in superficial or misleading cues-- style of dress, deportment, language usage, etc (e.g., Rist, 1970; 1973). In line with the self-fulfilling prophecy idea, youngsters so singled out are stigmitized, and suffer the adverse effects of being thought of by their teachers, and eventually by their peers and even by themselves, as "losers". One result is chronic underachievement that starts very early.

Such teacher expectancy effects, if potent and widespread, could explain why social background has so little independent influence on schooling outcomes at the secondary level. We know, for example, that school achievement trajectories take form very early and persist with a high degree of stability from one year to the next (e.g., Alexander and Cook, 1982; Entwisle and Hayduk, 1982) If the advantages and disadvantages revolving around social origins are absorbed into these early achievement patterns, then the damage may already be done well before high school. The practice of controlling for testing levels or other measures of developed competency in attempting to sort out "ascription" from "achievement" in studies at the secondary level, while entirely proper when trying to isolate processes peculiar to the secondary level, nevertheless will have the effect of obscuring precisely those aspects of process that express themselves in cognitive outcomes at the earlier grade levels. Such controls may partial out much, if not all, of the socioeconomic effects that are the object of interest. That the influence of SES background on cognitive performance appears to be larger in the earlier grades than in the later is consistent with this possibility (e.g., Alwin and Thornton, 1984).

Teacher expectancy effects thus could account for the failure of research at the secondary level to detect direct ascriptive disparities in performance outcomes. But the supporting evidence is far from compelling. Although Rosenthal and Jacobson's (1968) original experimental studies of the so-called "Pygmalion effect" were greeted with much enthusiasm, their evidence actually was quite weak. Moreover, their methodology has been criticized severely, and efforts to replicate their findings have been disappointing, despite many attempts by the original authors and others to document these processes (e.g., Elashoff and Snow, 1971; Dusek, 1975; Brophy and Good, 1974). Finally, it is relevant too that research intended to distinguish "achievement" from "ascription" in the primary grades (e.g., Davis and Haller, 1981; Leiter and Brown, 1985) has proven little more successful than studies at the secondary level in detecting socioeconomic "bias" in

achievement processes. While ill-founded teacher expectancies may well deflect some disadvantaged youngsters from the successes they might otherwise experience in school, it seems unlikely that such effects are either so pervasive or so potent as to be the operative mechanism of schools' supposed "middle class bias."

Where the reproductionistic thinking goes astray, we believe, is in assuming that the social relations of schooling are governed by a pervasive cultural hegemony. Teaching, to be sure, is the quintessential "middle class" occupation, and there is a strong normative mission orientation in the professional ideology-- to develop moral character along with cognitive skills (see Lortie, 1975, for further detail on these aspects of occupational standing and the professional role). But even if all the actors are reading from the same script, subtleties of interpretation matter a great deal, and this is no less true when enacting roles in everyday life than on the stage (see Sarbin and Allen, 1968, for an interpretation of role performance as role enactment). Sympathetic or hostile, conscientious or lax, skillful or inept -- in neglecting such dimensions of individual differences in role performance, the model of cultural hegemony implicitly denies their relevance and/or their importance. Such a posture strikes us as shortsighted.

In reflecting upon the poor showing of the teacher expectancy hypothesis, Brophy and Good (1974) propose a typology of teacher response styles. Their framework distinguishes among "proactive", "reactive", and "overreactive" teacher types, the latter being prone to inflexible, stereotyped thinking and hence most likely to set into motion self-fulfilling prophecy processes. Brophy and Good have little to say about the origins of such differences in teachers' styles, but they could be situationally conditioned to a great extent, and in ways relevant to the issue of socioeconomic bias. In particular, teachers' own social origins may be especially important in terms of the "match" or "mismatch" of student-teacher backgrounds. The transition from "home child" to "school child" requires adjustments for all youngsters, but for some the "school collar" will fit more comfortably

than for others and family background no doubt has bearing on the congeniality of the "fit" The way teachers respond to their students during this "settling in" period will determine how well these adjustment stresses are managed-- whether teachers are sympathetic or hostile, conscientious or lax, skillful or inept surely must matter.

Teachers are not simply professional automotons, and a perspective which strips them of their personal biographies, personality dispositions and affective orientations will surely miss much of what breathes life into classroom interaction patterns. In recent years the dominant theories and research agendas of educational sociologists have spoken of anything and everything but "the teacher". Subcultural values, school and classroom organization, clashing interests of parents and school systems, children's particularized developmental needs -- these were supposed to provide sufficient keys both to the educational process and to the effects of schools. "The teacher" was an old-fashioned concept, associated with dry and dusty studies of education untutored in sociology. In place of the teacher, sociologists conceived of "the classroom" as the arena in which schooling took place. Interest centered on "pupil inputs" and "school outputs". When noticed at all, the link between the two was conceptualized sometimes as a gatekeeper, sometimes as credential carrier, but rarely as an actor with a distinct persona including all the feelings, emotions and social history of a human being[1].

Racial and socioeconomic background are integral to one's personal and social identity, and this is just as true for teachers as for students. The influence of such factors is pervasive in a highly stratified social order. As both generalized status attributes (Berger, Cohen and Zelditch, 1972) and crude, but meaningful, measures of shared experience, they no doubt condition what transpires in many spheres of activity, including the interpersonal dynamics of the classroom (See Brophy and Good, 1974, for a review the literature on such personal attributes and classroom process). All teachers would be considered "middle class" by virtue of their professional affiliation, and most no

doubt would be so on the basis of their self-identifications as well. In terms of social origins, however, we would expect considerable diversity-- teaching has always been considered a "respectable" career for women, and for minority women it has had the distinction over the years of being one of the few readily penetrable professions.

An extensive literature on personal and political values documents the lasting imprint of social origins even among the highly mobile (see, for example, Barber, 1970; Lopreato, 1967; Thompson, 1971), and such vestiges likely condition the professional present as well. Teachers who feel a sense of commitment to minority and disadvantaged youngsters and who think well of their abilities are more successful in working with them (e.g., Smith, 1972; St. John, 1971), and it seems reasonable that a shared identity/common background should foster that sort of commitment. For one thing, "misleading cues" (e.g., style of dress, deportment, language usage) will not be misconstrued as fundamental failings by teachers whose own backgrounds make these cues familiar.

Teachers from high status backgrounds, on the other hand, will be less familiar with, and perhaps less comfortable with, the social surroundings of working class and poverty level youngsters. The status expectancy literature (Berger, Cohen, and Zelditch, 1972) indicates that status cues assume exaggerated importance in unfamiliar interpersonal situations. High status teachers who are "out of their element" and lack a background of common experience with their students may find it exceedingly difficult to form a bond of common identity -- this is precisely the sort of situation that lends itself to stereotyped response patterns, and these, in turn, are thought to be the foundation of negative teacher expectancy effects.

What is being proposed is a model of teacher-pupil "match" or "congruence"[2], with special attention to the situation of high status teachers with low status (in terms both of racial and social status) students. Low status origins are likely to be most disadvantaging where teachers are prone to exaggerate the significance of status cues, react to them

negatively, and respond in stereotyped fashion. Because of the relatively large social distance that separates high status teachers from low status students, we expect that the academic difficulties associated with low status student attributes will be greatest among the pupils of teachers from relatively advantaged social backgrounds.

This line of reasoning, then, specifies the conditions under which socioeconomic liabilities will be most detrimental to the social relations of schooling. In particular, we anticipate that teachers' social background will condition the influence of student background, and the operative agent of this conditioning should be negative teacher affect.

These issues are explored in the analyses that follow by examining how interactions among student race, student SES and teacher SES with respect to several measures of teacher affect/social cognition impinge on students' academic performance at the end of first grade. Measures include teachers' perceptions of school climate quality, parent-teacher agreement on standards of proper school conduct, teacher's expectations for their pupils' performance, and parent-teacher perceptions of students' personal maturity. If status "mismatch" complicates student-teacher relations in the ways anticipated, this would be reflected in lower levels of parent-teacher agreement on behavior standards, teachers offering less positive assessments than parents of pupil personal maturity, lower performance expectations, and lower school climate scores.

As measures of academic performance, we consider year-end marks in reading, math and conduct and standardized test scores in verbal and quantitative domains. Our framework anticipates that school performance will be most adversely affected by socioeconomic factors under conditions of high teacher status-low pupil status mismatch, and that these adverse effects will result from student-teacher social distance (e.g., as reflected in different behavior standards and depressed personal maturity assessments) and from negative teacher affect.

METHODS

The Sample

The data for this analysis come from the Beginning School Study (BSS), a panel study of youngsters attending Baltimore City elementary schools who began first grade in the fall of 1982. A stratified random sampling of 20 schools in the city system was drawn in such a way as to ensure a sample about equally divided by race and representative of all socioeconomic levels in the school system. In order to begin obtaining parental consent before the start of school in the fall, kindergarten rosters from 1981-82 served as initial sampling lists. These were supplemented by rosters of new registrants in the fall. Both rosters were used to draw random samples of children from each first grade classroom in the 20 schools in September 1982. Less than 3% of the children thus selected were excluded because of parent refusals. By this means 825 Baltimore City beginning first graders were selected into the study. While the BSS continues to monitor the academic progress of these youngsters, the present analysis relies almost exclusively on data from the first year of fieldwork.

Beginning in the summer and continuing into the fall of 1982 about 800 parents (usually the mother) were interviewed. In the summer following first grade about 600 of these parents were re-interviewed. Pupils were interviewed individually on two occasions during first grade (before the issuance of first quarter report cards in the fall and during the fourth marking period), and teachers were asked to respond to three questionnaires, staggered throughout the year. Fifty of fifty-five first grade teachers provided some data. School marks and CAT test scores for the beginning and end of the year were obtained from school records.

Student Variables

The measures pertaining to pupil background and performance are described next. Those involving the teachers, their perceptions of the students and their affective orientations are taken up in a separate section[3].

RACE. Race was coded 0 for white, 1 for black. The small number of oriental and Hispanic students in the sample were classifed as white (0).

SEX. Sex was coded 0 for boys, 1 for girls.

P-ED. Information on parent's educational attainment was obtained from the first parent interview. It is measured by the number of school years completed. For certain purposes the measure is trichotomized (i.e., less than high school, high school graduates, and schooling beyond high school).

Performance Outcomes

M, Marks. First and fourth quarter marks in reading (R) and mathematics (M) are E (Excellent), G (Good), S (Satisfactory), or U (Unsatisfactory), coded from "4" to "1" respectively. Marks in conduct are coded "2" for "satisfactory" or "1" for "needs improvement".

CAT scores. In October, 1982 and May 1983, system-wide testing provided California Achievement Test scores (Level 11 Form C). The verbal CAT score used here is the average of 4 subtests (phonic analysis, vocabulary, comprehension and language). The math CAT score is the average of 2 subtests (computation and concepts). If one or more subtests was missing, the "average" is the average of the available subtests.

Teacher Variables

TSES. Teacher's family of origin status is coded in the SEI metric from information on her father's occupation "when growing up".

Climate. Classroom or school climate is measured by responses to four items repeated in the fall and spring teacher questionnaires. Scale scores are the simple sum of the four response options, each of which ranged from "1" (most negative) to "5" (most positive). The items, with extremes in parentheses, are:

a. For most faculty, teaching here is (very unpleasant; very pleasant).

b. The climate in this school is (very tense; very warm).

c. Student-faculty relations here are (very poor; very good).

d. Trying to do your job right at this school is (very frustrating; very rewarding).

Coefficient alpha for the fall scale is .89; for the spring scale, .92. The fall-spring correlation is .74. Spring scale scores were given priority in the analysis. Fall scores were substituted if spring responses were lacking.

T-P Agree. Agreement on deportment standards was determined from information provided by parents and teachers who were asked to give examples of what they considered to be "good" and "poor" conduct. Open-ended responses were coded into a classification derived inductively from careful review of response patterns. Seven measures were derived for "good conduct", eight for "poor conduct". Respondents received a score for each, which is the number of instances mentioned in a particular category (with values ranging from zero to "N", the maximum number mentioned). The following distinctions were developed for good conduct (with examples of each in parentheses):

1. Follows rules (minds teacher; is good; raises hand; pays attention);

2. Respects others (shows concern for others; works well with peers);
3. Respects self (understands own ability; shows self-respect; acts age; mature);
4. Good citizen (maintains attractive classroom; good attendance; takes pride in work);
5. Shows initiative (works independently; takes responsibility; takes leadership role);
6. Conforms to academic routine (finishes tasks; does homework; has good work habits);
7. Proper values (polite; respects adults and property; helpful)

The converse for all good conduct distinctions were used to categorize poor conduct, along with an eighth measure for "acting out", used for extreme behavioral problems (e.g., cries; hyper; jumps around; clowns). These individual response patterns are the basis for determining levels of parent-teacher agreement, which is constructed as the percent of these fifteen categories for which both parent and teacher had non-zero values when either had a non-zero value. Failure by both parties to mention a category was not credited as agreement.

T-P Mature. Teacher-Parent differences in their evaluations of students' personal maturity were derived from responses to a series of 14 items taken from the 1976 version of the National Survey of Children. Using a grid labelled "exactly like", "very much like", "pretty much like", "somewhat like", "a little like", "not at all like", teachers in the early spring of 1983 rated each student. Item values ranged from one to six, with scores ranging from less to more positive:

1. Very enthusiastic, interested in a lot of different things, likes to express his/her ideas.
2. Fights too much; teases, picks on or bullies other children.
3. Can't concentrate, can't pay attention for long.
4. Usually in a happy mood; very cheerful.
5. Rather high strung, tense, and nervous.
6. Is not liked much by other children.
7. Cheats; tells lies; is deceitful.
8. Shows creativity or originality in school work.
9. Acts too young for his/her age, cries a lot or has tantrums.
10. Has a very strong temper; loses it easily.
11. Is awfully restless, fidgets all the time, can't sit still.
12. Keeps to himself/herself; tends to withdraw.
13. Very timid, afraid of new things or new situations.

14. Is polite, helpful, considerate of others.

Factor analyses of the teacher evaluations indicated that a single factor dominated the response pattern, and that this factor structure held when separate analyses were conducted for children of the two sexes as well as the two races. Consequently, a scale of perceived personal maturity was developed as the simple sum of responses to these fourteen items. The alpha reality of this scale is 0.87. (The alpha is reduced less than .02 when any single item is deleted.)

In the summer between the first and second years, responses to this same set of items were obtained from 510 parents (or about 82 percent of the 625 panel youngsters who stayed in the original 20 schools through the second year -- the others were lost owing to transfer, either outside the city system or to other schools with the city)[4]. These items also were summed to form a composite. The coefficient alpha for the resulting scale is .74, considerably lower than that obtained for the teacher scale.

Differences in teacher and parent evaluations of student maturity are determined as the simple difference in their respective scale scores. For use in later regression analyses, we also have constructed a measure of perceived maturity level, which is the sum of the teacher and parent responses.

A "sum and differences" method has been used with some success to distinguish "status inconsistency" effects from "status level" effects (see Hope, 1975), and the approach has been adopted for our present purposes. The effects of these two measures when used together in a regression analysis are equivalent to those that would be obtained as the main effects of the two separate scales, but the "level" and "difference" expression of those relationships is more appropriate to our substantive interest in identifying the bases of teacher/parent differences and in evaluating their consequences for student performance.

T-EXP. Early in the spring teachers were asked their expectations for how well the sample students in their class would do in school the following year. Teacher expectations were procured for reading, math and conduct, using the same distinctions as employed in assigning report card marks (i.e., from "excellent" to "unsatisfactory" in Reading and Math; "satisfactory" versus "needs improvement" in Conduct). As with report card marks, the subject responses are coded from "4" to "1", and conduct expectations "2" versus "1".

RESULTS

The fundamental premise of this inquiry is that teacher's own social origins will condition their responses to minority students and to youngsters from disadvantaged family backgrounds. It is expected in particular that teachers with higher status backgrounds will be less familiar with and less comfortable with the social world and personal style of lower status pupils. Interpersonal relations between pupil and teacher will be strained under such circumstances, and teacher effectiveness likely will be compromised as a result. In terms of the present empirical agenda, we expect the social relations of such classrooms will be characterized by lower levels of teacher-parent agreement on "proper" standards of conduct, lower levels of evaluated student maturity comparing teachers' perceptions against parents', less positive teacher assessments of the "school climate"[5], and lower teacher expectations for students' future performance. These negatives, in turn, ought to depress pupil achievement. More specifically, it is expected that pupil status characteristics (i.e., race and family background) will be more strongly related to school performance in the classrooms of teachers with higher social origins than in the classrooms of teachers with lower social orgins. Also, such status differences in year-end achievements will be maintained or exacerbated through the negative affect and/or perceptions that distances low status pupils from their high status teachers.

These expectations direct attention to interactions between student and teacher status attributes. The relevant descriptive comparisons are presented in Table 1. Mean values of the teacher perception/affect measures and of the student performance measures are displayed for the cross-classification of teacher social origins with student race and with student's social background (as indexed by parent's education). Two levels of teacher SES background are distinguished by dividing the teachers' distribution of father's SEI level at the sample mean (37 and below vs 38 and above). Scores in this mid-range identify these teachers, as a group, as coming from the "solid lower-middle class"-- some representative occupations at this status level would include police officer, restaurant or bar manager, jeweler or watchmaker, and farm manager. However, with a sample-wide standard deviation of almost 23, it is clear that these teachers have been recruited from a wide range of family backgrounds. As mentioned above, three levels of parent's education are distinguished: less than high school; high school graduate; greater than high school.

The comparisons afforded by Table 1 are, in general, highly consistent with our reasoning; in fact, remarkably so in light of the many sources of "slippage" in the way we have been able to implement these ideas: different status dimensions are used to locate parents' and teachers' socioeconomic standing, and these don't map onto one another especially well[6]; sample size restrictions limit us to a crude dichotomy in the case of teachers; and the case base is much smaller than would be desirable in critical "cells" (e.g., the situation of high SES teachers with high SES pupils)[7]. It appears, though, that these status processes are sufficiently potent as to present themselves even despite such procedural shortcomings. It also appears that student race is much more salient as a line of demarcation than family background, although the considerations just mentioned suggest that contrasts revolving around family background may be dampened in these comparisons.

Hence, the present approach probably understates the magnitude of status constraints in student-teacher relations.

While interest focuses on the high SES teacher-low status pupil "mismatch", it is clear from Table 1 that other status combinations also influence teacher perceptions and affective orientations, and in complex ways. Consider the case of teacher-parent agreement on behavior standards. Among low SES teachers there is a five-and-a-half point spread in the percentages of agreement with white as opposed to black parents, with agreement higher for white parents. The sample-wide standard deviation for the agreement measure is slightly over 17, so the race difference for low SES teachers is almost a third of a standard deviation. This strikes us a relatively large, especially when considered against the difference of under two points observed among high status teachers-- and both of the latter's percentages fall below the corresponding percentages for low status teachers.

While high status teachers tend to hold to different deportment standards than parents regardless of race, the standards of low SES teachers are more similar to white parents' than to black-- a difference that emerges where socioeconomic distance is small (considering the general composition of the city system enrollment)[8]. Among low SES teachers, levels of agreement with parents decline from a high of 36 percent with low SES parents (ie., education less than high school) to 27.6 with high SES parents (i.e., some schooling beyond high school)-- a difference of half a standard deviation. The percentages for high SES teachers are lower in all three instances, and the spread across status levels is noticably smaller (less than three points). Here, though, agreement is highest in the case of highly educated parents and lowest where parent's education is low.

At least with regard to expected standards of conduct, we find that home-school compatibility is very much conditioned by the teacher's own social background-- a first chink in the armor of the "cultural hegemony" argument. The situation is very much the

same when considering discrepancies in parents' and teachers' opinions regarding students levels of personal maturity. These data are presented in terms of difference scores in the last row of the top panel of Table 1, but before turning to these data we offer as background a few comments regarding the evaluations made by parents and teachers separately.

The general patterning of teacher and parent assessments corresponds surprisingly well. The sample-wide averages, for example, are 68 and 67, respectively[9]. The means are virtually identical for black students (67.4 vs. 67.3), and differ by only 1.3 points for white students (with the teacher average being the higher of the two, at 68.6 vs. 67.3). The averages go up in moving from low to high student SES, but this happens for both parents and teachers: for low SES youngsters the teacher and parent averages are 65.6 and 65.1; for high SES youngsters the respective figures are 69.0 and 70.1. Hence, race differences are small and status differences a good bit larger in the evaluations of both parents and teachers. It turns out as well, though, that parents' evaluations of their children's maturity are more homogeneous than teachers' (the respective scale standard deviations are 9.0 and 12.2, sample-wide), and the "discrepancies" implied by the greater variability of teacher assessments present themselves in precisely the way anticipated under our model of teacher-pupil congruence.

As just mentioned, teachers overall rate students a little higher on the personality scale than parents. Sample-wide the difference is 1.3 points, based on the subset of students for whom both teacher and parent assessments are available. The standard deviation for the distribution of difference scores derived by subtracting parent's scores from teacher's is 11.5 (values for the maturity scale can range from 14 to 84). Turning now to Table 1, among low SES teachers we find positive difference averages throughout, with that for blacks exceeding whites and that for high SES youngsters exceeding that for low. In all instances, though, the differences are small: for race it is but 1.1 units

and the largest SES difference is only 1.16 units (comparing mid-SES youth against low). In comparison, the disparities involving high SES teachers are much more substantial. In fact, in the case of black youngsters and of those from the lowest SES families, teachers' evaluations actually average below those made by parents (this is reflected in negative table entries). The black-white difference is just over 3.5 points (or about .3 standard deviations), while the difference comparing mid-SES youth against low is just under five points (4.73), or over .4 standard deviations[10].

The indicators of "maturity" involve mainly "good pupil" and "receptive learner" role definitions (see, Kedar-Voivadas, 1983), at least in the primary grades: is enthusiastic; doesn't tease; doesn't cheat; shows creativity; doesn't fidget; doesn't lose temper; is polite and helpful. That high SES teachers perceive their black students and their pupils from low SES backgrounds as relatively lacking in such qualities does not auger well for developing a close bond between teacher and pupil.

In fact, such adverse effects are suggested in the patterning of teachers' school climate scores. Among low SES teachers, attitudes regarding the character of the school environment are unrelated to either student race or student SES: all the averages hover around 16.30, which is just above the sample-wide average of 15.8 (with a standard deviation of 3.8).

High SES teachers, though, hold very different opinions, and these vary as a function of the "pupil context". The difference in their average climate scores for black and white students is 4.62 units, or more than a full standard deviation (favoring whites). Comparing high against low SES students, high SES teacher climate responses differ by 2.23 points, which exceeds half a standard deviation. These climate scores, of course, apply classroom-wide, while our table entries use the individual student as the unit of comparison. Given that there is some degree of both racial and socioeconomic

heterogeneity in most of these settings[11], this degree of differentiation at the individual level seems all the more impressive.

To this point, then, we have seen that the high SES teachers of minority and low SES youngsters are "outliers" in several critical respects: they hold to different behavior standards than their pupils' parents, they see these children as lacking in many of the qualities that make for "attractive" students, and they feel much less positive about the overall quality of the school environment. In light of these differences, it should come as no surprise that they also hold lower expectations for their pupils' performance. Since expectations in subject areas are measured on a four point scale, and those for conduct on a two point scale, small absolute differences can be large relatively, which is what we see in Table 1. The standard deviation for teachers' subject area expectations is .9 for both reading and math, while that for conduct is .35. When considered against this standard, the black-white differences of .66 in reading, .67 in math and .17 in conduct observed for high SES teachers appear quite large, and all exceed by a considerable margin the corresponding differences observed for low SES teachers. In this instance, though, we find somewhat larger expectation differences across the SES gradient among low SES teachers than among high, owing to the rather low expectations held by the latter for high SES youngsters.

The lower panel of Table 1 provides a similar organization of student performance outcomes: end of year marks in reading, math and conduct and spring test scores in verbal and quantitative domains. Here pupil SES differences again appear somewhat larger among low SES teachers than high, but the pattern by race is quite consistent with that observed above: blacks do worse and whites do better when taught by high SES teachers. These comparisons, though, neglect differences that might be expected based on students' initial abilities, and hence their implications are clouded. The same could be said regarding the differences in teachers expectations just reviewed: they could reflect

simply an accurate reading of competency differences, and so have little, if anything, to do with the dynamics of status relationships. This possibility cannot be addressed in the simple descriptive detail of Table 1. The regression results, to which we turn next, adjust for competency differences and will help sort out these various possibilities.

Our analysis of the teacher affect measures is presented in the three panels of Table 2: the first pertains to the full sample; the second to pupils of low SES origin teachers; and the third to pupils of high SES origin teachers. Each of the teacher perception/affect variables is evaluated separately using several student background predictors (student race, gender, and parent's educational level using the full range of values) and controls for fall CAT scores. When domain-specific teacher expectations are the outcomes, fall scores from that domain are used (ie., verbal for reading expectations, quantitative for math expectations). For all other outcomes, both verbal and quantitative controls are employed. These fall testing data adjust for competency differences at the time of school entry, so effects of other student traits are estimated with these differences controlled[12]. Should racial and/or SES disparities persist, they presumably would have to be grounded in something other than competency differences, and the "status relations" accounting will have withstood at least this test of alternative possibilities.

To simplify the presentation, only coefficients for race and SES background are presented. For the pooled sample, the results for an equation which adds teacher's SEI to the set of predictors also are reported. This will allow us to judge the magnitude of teacher background main effects. But differences in the importance of student background with high versus low SES teachers, our major concern, are revealed in the second and third panels of Table 2.

In the full sample, teacher SEI effects generally are quite small. Four of the six fail to attain significance, and the other two are of modest size. Nevertheless, agreement

with parents on deportment standards tends to decline as teacher social origins increase, as does teacher sentiment (as indexed by perceived school climate).

With regard to student predictors in the pooled analysis, scores on all measures of teacher affect/perception, except the maturity scale, are lower for blacks than for whites. The largest of these differences involves the climate scale, followed by differences in performance expectations. Effects associated with parent's education generally are a good bit smaller, even though most still reach significance. All of these favor high status youngsters, save that involving conduct standards, for which agreement is somewhat higher at lower levels of parent's education.

Even with initial testing levels controlled then, we still see many instances in which teachers' perceptions and evaluations are influenced by student background. It remains to be seen next whether the details of this "conditioning" are themselves conditioned by the details of teachers' background.

The second and third panels of Table 2 suggest that such interactions are powerful indeed. Not a single black-white difference is significant among low SES teachers, whereas four of the six are significant among high SES teachers and all of these are moderate to large. At -.49, the difference in perceived school climate when teaching black as opposed to white students is especially striking. Also noteworthy is the finding that blacks are expected to perform more than half a marking unit below whites in both reading and math-- and this, it will be recalled, with initial cognitive differences controlled (as we shall see shortly, blacks also receive lower marks than whites from such teachers).

In comparison to these race differences, student SES effects are much less pronounced. Among high status teachers, the only significant coefficient involves the school climate measure: high SES teachers evaluate climate more positively when teaching high SES pupils. In conjunction with the large race difference here, this implies

that high SES teachers react negatively when obliged to work with both black and low SES youngsters.

In contrast, student race has little bearing on the affective orientations of low status origin teachers. We do note, though, that such teachers apparently are favorably impressed by high SES student background in framing their performance expectations (and this depite their lack of agreement with the criteria for good and poor deportment espoused in such households). In this instance, then, lack of personal experience seems to produce a positive halo-- positive because of the high valuation attaching to the students' status cues and the direction of the status distance separating teacher from pupil.

The higher expectations held by low SES teachers for their high status pupils apparently do not color their ideas regarding the overall quality of the school environment, however, and when it comes to student race, their expectations and perceptions are "color-blind" throughout. Race figures prominently in the perceptions evaluations of high SES teachers, however, and these teachers also feel much more positive about the teaching situation when in the company of high SES pupils[13]. In the remaining analyses we consider how this affects students of different racial and social backgrounds in terms of their year-end performance.

Tables 3 and 4 have the same general format as Table 2-- three panels in each, one for the full sample which includes teacher SES in the predictor set, and separate analyses for the students of low and high SES teachers, respectively. The performance measures are fourth quarter marks (Table 3) and spring test scores (Table 4). The first equation in each panel presents the effects of pupil race and pupil family SES from analyses which include controls for gender and fall test scores. This parallels the procedures used in the first row of results from Table 2. The second row adds teacher SES to the analysis, and so applies only to the pooled sample assessment. The results from rows 3 through 6 are of particular interest. One of the teacher affect/perception

measures is evaluated in each of these to examine its consequences for student achievement and its possible role in contributing to, or maintaining, the disadvantages associated with student background. Their importance in the first regard is indicated in the significance and magnitude of their respective coefficients; their possible importance in the second regard is suggested by the attenuation of background differences when they are added to the analysis. By evaluating these measures separately we ignore any redundancy in this predictor set, but in the present inquiry we are more interested in determining the plausibility of the congruence hypothesis than in trying to formulate a cogent model of teacher affect. For this agenda, the "wide net" approach to rooting out possible sources of teacher influence seems warranted.

The patterning of results is broadly similar across achievement outcomes. In the pooled analysis, blacks perform below whites on all criteria, and the differences appear somewhat greater for marks than for test scores. Differences associated with student SES background are not nearly so pervasive, and those that do reach significance are quite small (e.g., fourth quarter marks in math and quantitative test scores). Nevertheless, there is at least a tendency for high SES youngsters to do better at year's end than low SES youngsters, even with entry level testing differences taken into account.

As anticipated, the main effects of teacher status background on student performance are slight-- only one of the five TSES coefficients is significant (that for Reading marks -- see Table 3), and with a standardized effect just above .1 even this effect would have to be considered quite modest. However, several of the teacher affect/perception measures are found to be of considerable consequence. In four of five instances, positive school climate scores are associated with superior performance. The teacher expectation coefficients also are significant and sizeable in all instances. That the effects of the latter are especially large for fourth quarter marks is not at all

surprising, since the same judgments that influence teachers' expectations regarding future pe formance no doubt enter into their concurrent evaluations as well. What is striking though, is that these teacher evaluations figure so prominently in the learning process independent of entry level ability differences. Morover, these effects are diminished very little even when first quarter marks are controlled[14].

It is noteworthy too that positive deviation scores on the personal maturity scale comparing teachers' responses against parents' also are associated with superior student performance, and here again these effects persist even with first quarter marks controlled (not shown in tables). These results seem to indicate that the process of impression formation is an on-going one throughout the year, and in particular that teachers' evaluations of their pupils' "character" are much more sensitive than parents' to achievement relevant cues.

While it is clear from these results that teacher "discriminations" map onto the achievement distribution quite well, what this implies in terms of teacher influence is less certain. It is possible, for example, that these teachers are simply responding to qualities of their students that parents either do not see or do not interpret in the same way, and that such youngsters would do just as well in school even with less discerning teachers. This accounting speaks well for teachers' diagnostic skills, but presumes little or no follow through, at least not of the sort that makes a difference-- this would correspond to Brophy and Good's "reactive" teacher type. A second possibility, though, is that such qualities assume their importance precisely because they attract the teachers' attention, and having done so they impinge on other aspects of teacher sentiment (e.g., witness the school climate effects in Tables 3 and 4) and they alter classroom dynamics. Under this scenario, teachers' perceptions and evaluations play a much more active role in the achievement process. The fact that such effects are not only apparent but actually quite large despite our controls for initial ability differences and early achievement patterns

would seem to favor the "teacher intervention" interpretation. That these processes are found to play themselves out differently for different kinds of teachers also would seem to belie the "passive teacher" construction. These contrasts are revealed in comparing the second and third panels of Tables 3 and 4.

Higher levels of perceived maturity and high performance expectations are associated with high marks and test scores among both low SES and high SES backgound teachers. Hence, at least these aspects of teacher affect/perception are important across the board. But we again find race differences only among high status background teachers, with whites, on average, surpassing blacks by a wide margin on all criteria (none of the differences associated with parent's education reaches significance)[15]. Importantly, when maturity scores are contolled, these racial disparities are reduced substantially (on the order of a third or better)[16], and when teacher's expectations are controlled four of the six drop to insignificance (the exceptions are fourth quarter conduct marks and quantitative CAT scores).

It thus appears that low teacher expectations and unfavorable assessments of student maturity/immaturity could account for these race differences in school performance, which are observed only among high SES background teachers. And while such perceptions/expectations are influential in both contexts, we saw earlier that high status teachers held especially negative opinions of their minority students. As a general consideration, it is of some comfort to learn that teachers' ideas about their students make a difference-- as sources of encouragement they no doubt impel many youngsters to higher levels of accomplishment than would be realized otherwise. But "significant others" can exercise their influence for good or for bad, and in the case of minority students of high SES teachers, the net effect is decidedly negative.

Interestingly, the other side of the equation is at least hinted at in some of the results for low SES background teachers. The only instances in which racial differences

reach significance in the classrooms of such teachers is when the personal maturity measures are introduced as controls (in Table 3, for all three marking areas, and in Table 4 for CAT-Q). An increase in the black-white performance differential at this point in the analysis implies that the minority "shortfall" in school performance relative to whites actually is dampened somewhat owing to the favorable opinions held of them by their teachers-- the T-P Mature effect is positive here as it was among high SES teachers, but it will be recalled the low SES teachers actually evaluated their black pupils somewhat more favorably than their white pupils relative to the evaluations made by parents. In this instance, then, positive teacher assessments appear to moderate educational disadvantage-- a welcome counterpoint to the discomforting trend observed among high SES background teachers.

Finally, we observe significant school climate effects only for high SES teachers, and these appear only in the results for spring test performance (see Table 4). It earlier was found that Climate scores were especially low for the high SES teachers of minority youth, and hence the present results give reason to believe that the cognitive gains of black youngsters suffer tangibly as a consequence of such teacher disaffection. In the concluding section we offer some thoughts on the significance and implications of these findings.

DISCUSSION

Studies of educational stratification (e.g., Hauser, 1970) direct attention to ways in which the workings of schools serve either to perpetuate or moderate socioeconomic inequalities across generations. Our point of departure in this investigation was the widely held assumption that minority youth and youngsters from low SES families experience academic difficulties because of their "outsider" standing vis-a-vis the middle class culture that is thought to govern the social relations of schooling. Research, though, has failed to document such disadvantages, nor is there much support for the

related proposition that such adverse consequences are filtered through negative teacher expectations or biases. To be sure, many minority and disadvantaged youngsters do experience academic difficulties, and it is equally certain that the reactions of teachers are very much implicated in the details of such school achievement processes. But where these ideas miss the mark is in assuming an exaggerated cultural hegemony in the way schools work.

The present evidence indicates that not all teachers are equally given to status-related biases, and, in particular, that teachers' own social origins exercise a strong influence on how they react to the status attributes of their pupils. High SES background teachers experience special difficulties in relating to minority and low SES youngsters-- their standards of deportment are different than those held by such youths' parents, they perceive such youngsters as relatively lacking in the qualities of personal maturity that make for a "good student," they hold lower performance expectations for such youngsters, and they evaluate the school climate much less favorably when working with "outsider" students. As a result, blacks who begin first grade testing at levels very similar to their white age-mates have fallen noticeably behind by year's end. What we have witnessed here, then, probably is the onset of race differentiated achievement trajectories. Once having fallen behind, it is exceedingly difficult to catch up, and these data trace much of this early shortfall to the status dynamics of pupil-teacher relationships.

The picture is sobering indeed: when high social distance separates teacher from student, negative teacher perceptions, low expectations, and teacher disaffection ensue. And it is hardly surprising in such situations that teachers should fail to "bring out the best" in their students. But the literature on status biases and teacher expectancies would have us believe that this rather bleak portrait of teacher-pupil relationships is pervasive. This simply isn't the case, and in failing to specify the conditions under which

classroom dynamics might be expected to assume this form, previous studies have missed the mark. All teachers are not the same, and teachers' reactions depend on their personal circumstances. Our model of teacher-pupil background "congruence" or "fit" suggested where lack of fit might be especially pernicious, and indeed it is: the case of high SES background teachers/low status students.

Such status effects could potentially be of great consequence, even if they do not operate "across the board." In fact, there is a perverse irony in the possibility that minority youngsters and those from disadvantaged backgrounds suffer academically because of their marginality vis-a-vis the dominant status culture. We know from Heyns' (1978) research, for example, that these are precisely the youth for whom the intellective stimulation of schooling matters most, and many studies, beginning with the well-known EEO Report (Coleman, et al., 1966), have shown the performance of minority and disadvantaged youngsters to be expecially sensitive to the details of their school experience and to the characteristics of their teachers (e.g., St. John, 1971). Hence, the price paid for such marginality is doubly dear: the consequences are borne by those whose skill development is most dependent upon the schools and the impact is magnified owing to the receptiveness of such youth to school influence, be it for good or for bad.

As agents of academic socialization teachers likely place second only to parents, and their influence probably is especially great in the primary grades, as here youngsters still are acclimating to the academic routine. That students are less "set in their ways" at this stage of schooling is one obvious consideration, but organizational differences also are conducive. Instructional specialization, for example, is less common in the primary grades. As a consequence, students will have close contact with fewer teachers, each of whom has broad responsibility.

As the front-line representative of the school, the teacher mediates the student's relations to the broader institutional environment. Teachers are the very embodiment of

organizational authority, and with young children they represent adult authority as well. In the social relations of the classroom it is the teacher who doles out rewards and punishments, bears responsibility for performance evaluations and maintains control over classroom resources. In the primary grades, they also wipe runny noses and console hurt feelings-- a joining of formal and nurturant responsibilities that is peculiar to the role of the elementary teacher[17].

This blending together of the instrumental and the affective precludes reducing the issue of teacher effectiveness to a tidy technical agenda or substituting the impersonal "classroom" for the teacher in linking pupil inputs to school outputs. The environment of the classroom is intensely interpersonal, and "good teaching" is not simply a matter of using time wisely, of selecting the right reading series, or of adopting a particular classroom management technique, despite the tendency for school improvement policies to be cast in such terms[18]. Nor is it reducible to matters of "professional development," for educational background and experience are of little importance in distinguishing effective from ineffective teachers.

What is neglected in all these perspectives are differences of teacher background and or personality that will determine to a considerable extent what actually transpires in the classroom. The teacher implements the curriculum, regulates time usage, and structures classroom process, and "whether she is sympathetic or hostile, faithful or lax, skillful or inept surely must matter." Our results remind us of the social-psychological dynamics that underlie classroom process. Pupil performance is driven down where teachers are distant and disaffected. In one sense, the situation of high status teachers working with disadvantaged youngsters is but a particular instance of this general proposition. But the conditions that give rise to such sentiment are themselves "socially structured," and this transforms what otherwise would be simply a personal problem into a social one.

FOOTNOTES

1 This neglect of teacher's individuality is hardly peculiar to the reproductionist literature. Levin (1980), for example, has been especially critical of what he calls the "Professional Paradigm" of teacher effectiveness that dominates the research literature. This approach defines "capability" in terms of training and experience to the near exclusion of all else. Perhaps this premature narrowing of the field explains why studies so framed have proven singularly unenlightening.

2. See Epstein and McPartland (1977) and Epstein (1983) for another perspective on home-school "fit" and a review of the considerations that recommend such a focus. Their analysis examines decision-making styles in the two settings.

3. Our analysis uses data from school records, one pupil interview, two parent interviews and three teacher questionnaires. To avoid excessive sample loss owing to item non-response or some gap in instrument coverage, missing values were imputed for some pupil variables-- test scores, marks, parent's education, and parent's and teacher's maturity scale responses. About fifteen percent of the values were missing on the measures procured from teachers and parents, one to three percent for the others. To improve upon the "quality" of the imputed values, means were computed separately for youngsters held back at the end of first grade and for those promoted. Missing values then were assigned to individuals based on their own year-end promotion status.

4. During the first two-years of BSS fieldwork, youngsters were lost from the panel if they left the original set of twenty schools. By the end of first grade, about 120 of the original 825 had tranferred out, and by the beginning of the second grade the sample size stood at 660. We subsequently have been able to expand our coverage to all public schools in the city system, and some of the youngsters lost during the first two years

have been recovered. The present analysis, though, is based on those who remained in the schools originally sampled. A careful check of attrition during this period reveals no obvious biases, however. For example, 27 percent of the original sample consisted of black females, 28 percent of black males, 23 percent of white females and 22 percent of white males. The corresponding figures for the subsample of "survivors" through three years of fieldwork are 27, 29, 22 and 22, respectively. Similarly, the distribution of youngsters across school types (integration status by SES level) differ no more than one percent across categories in any instance (e.g., the percent enrolled in black middle class schools in the original sample was 12.0%; the figure after three years was 11.9%; for integrated middle class schools the respective figures are 9.7% and 10.3%).

5. The importance of a positive school atmosphere has been underscored in many studies using widely differing methodologies (e.g., Brookover, et.al., 1978; McDill and Rigsby, 1973; Rutter, et. al., 1979). Our data are not unlike those typically elicited from school personnel and aggregated up to the school level in order to characterize the global affective or normative context, but we use them directly as measures of teacher orientation.

6. Data on parent's occupation were not procured until the third year of BSS fieldwork. Our coverage is incomplete owing to further shrinkage in the sample size and the fact that many of our respondents, being either unemployed or out of the workforce, reported no current occupation. Hence, it was not practical to array both parents and teachers along the same status dimension.

7. As can be seen from Table 1, the sample sizes for most of our comparisons generally fall in the 100-150 range, but some are a good bit smaller than would be desirable. The case base for high SES teachers of high SES pupils, at about 40, is particularly small.

8. We are confident that these differences, as well as those presented in the regression analyses that follow, involve teacher status background and not teacher race. About 70 percent of the youngsters in these analyses are taught by black teachers, and teachers' race and SES background are modestly correlated (.23 at the zero-order level, with white teachers having somewhat higher father's SEI scores). All multivariate analyses reported in Tables 2-4 have been performed with teacher's race substituted for teacher's SES origins, and with both included at the same time. In general, SES is much more strongly related to the affect/perception measures than race, and while teacher's race is related to student performance, our conclusions regarding SES background and teacher perception/affect hardly change at all when race is controlled. Since differences associated with teacher's race are incidental to our present concerns, and since they seem to involve somewhat different mediating mechanisms than those considered here, the race issue is not pursued in the present inquiry. A preliminary investigation of teacher race effects (along with teacher SES effects) is available in Alexander, Entwisle, Pallas and Cadigan, 1985.

9. The figures referred to in this paragraph regarding maturity scale scores are not presented in tables.

10. Teachers' assessments of high SES youth exceed parent evaluations by a smaller margin than for mid-SES youth, but the difference at least is positive. And at 1.66, the difference comparing high and low SES youngsters still surpasses that observed among low SES teachers. The case base for the situation of high SES teachers with high SES students is only 41, so it is not too surprising that trends involving this group might be less clear (and less secure) than others. But small numbers do not obscure the fact that high SES teachers evaluate black youngsters and low SES youth less favorably than their

parents, while in all other instances teachers evaluate pupil maturity more favorably than do parents.

11. Six of the 20 schools are all (or nearly all) black and five are all (or nearly all) white. The percent black enrollment in the other nine ranges from 8 to 87, with five in the 25-65 range. In terms of parent's educational levels, the school averages range from 10.2 years to 15.7 years, with standard deviations ranging from 1.3 to 3.0.

12. These entry-level cognitive differences actually were quite small, at least along racial lines. Blacks scored only two points below whites on the verbal subtest (or .06 pooled standard deviations), and five points on the math subtest (or .22 pooled standard deviations). By year's end, though, the race gap had widened considerably in both domains (to 8.2 points and 10.1 points, respectively), and we have reason to believe that the teacher effects documented in the present analysis are very much implicated in this pattern of differential growth-- see below.

13. Our results regarding influences upon teacher affect/perception also hold up well when teacher's race is controlled and, for teachers' performance expectations, when first quarter marks are controlled. In only two or three instances do significant effects in Table 2 fail to achieve significance when teacher race is controlled. For all of these, the effects were small to begin with and the actual shrinkage is slight (e.g., the pooled sample race effect on T/P Agree drops from -.092 to -.082; the race effect on T-P Mature among high SES teachers drops from -.134 to -.078). Also, several coefficients increase in magnitude, crossing the threshold from non-significant to significant (e.g., the effect of TSES on T.Exp-Read goes from .065 to .075). All these changes are minor, though, and do not alter our conclusions at all. When first quarter marks are controlled in the expectation equations, we do, as expected, observe substantial attentuation of many

coefficients, mostly involving differences associated with student race (for example, the race effect on reading expectations drops from -.175 to -.068 in the pooled analysis). This is a stringent control, though, and most of the differences that were significant originally remain so (the two race differences involving conduct expectations drop out, but the four that were significant for subject-area expectations retain their significance) and the general pattern of large background effects among the pupils of high SES origin teachers remains unaltered.

14. Our conclusions here too are altered very little when race and first quarter marks are used as additional controls. Only three significant effects in Tables 3 and 4 drop to non-significance when teacher's race is controlled, and again the actual shrinkage is quite small (e.g., the race effect on CAT-Q in the pooled analysis drops from -.074 to -.054). Also, we again find several instances in which coefficients increase modestly (e.g., the coefficient for TSES on CAT-Q goes from -.059 and nonsignificant, to a significant -.083). The consequences of controlling on first quarter marks are much more substantial in terms of attenuating other influences on performance, but here too most significant effects remain so and the overall pattern is preserved. Some of the significant race differences in the pooled analysis do "drop out", as well as one race difference in the "high SES" teacher subsample (this involves CAT-V, where the race coefficient shrinks from -.171 to -.096). For all other outcomes, race differences persist (e.g., the race effect for CAT-Q falls from -.236 to -.154; for reading marks it falls from -.286 to -.170). With first quarter marks two of T-P Mature effects among high SES teachers become non-significant (those for Reading and Math marks), but three of five persist and, importantly, all of the teacher expectation effects remain large: for reading marks, for example, the effect drops from .774 to .687; for CAT-V from .510 to .455; and, for CAT-Q from .363 to .259. Hence, even with fall testing levels and first quarter marks controlled, teachers'

performance expectations are found to have a large, independent effect on both year-end marks and cognitive growth.

15. These race differences are quite apparent in the patterning of cognitive gains across settings. Among the subset of youngsters for whom teacher background data are available, gains on the verbal CAT subtest average 54 points from fall to spring and 44 points on the quantitative subtest. The black and white students of low SES teachers each gained 54 verbal points, on average. Among the students of high SES teachers, though, blacks gained 49 points, against 59 points for whites. Similar trends are observed on the quantitative test: black and white gains for low SES teachers averaged 46 and 47 points, respectively; the corresponding figures for high SES teachers are 36 and 44. Similarly, the SES gradient is steeper among the pupils of high SES teachers. For them, the "high"-"low" span in average gain scores is 9 points on the verbal test and five points on the quantitative versus seven and four among the pupils of low SES background teachers. The latter contrasts are not very different overall, but there are interesting details not apparent in these overall figures. There is, for example, a tendency for the high SES pupils of low SES teachers to have lower than expected gain scores (their gains average below those for mid SES youngsters in the verbal domain, and they fall below both low and mid SES youngsters in the verbal). Hence, at least with regard to cognitive growth, there is some indication that both forms of "mismatch" are detrimental. But these are offsetting to some extent, with the result that SES differences (among pupils) are less pronounced than race differences when comparing the performance of high and low SES teachers separately.

16. It is important to keep in mind that these "difference" effects are estimated with level of personal maturity (i.e., the sum of teacher and parent responses) controlled. That maturity level seems to have very real consequences in terms of pupil achievement is

indicated in the substantial increments to R-squared that are obtained when these measures are added to the regression model.

17. Hence, both administrative and developmental considerations identify the primary grades as an especially promising locale for teacher intervention, and this seems to be indicated as well in the literature on teacher effects at the elementary level (see, for example, Bossert, 1979; Brown and Saks, 1975; Pedersen, Faucher and Eaton, 1978; Summers and Wolfe, 1977).

18. Barr and Dreeben (1983) come close to committing this error in their otherwise excellent study of instructional practice in the primary grades. See Karweit (1985) for a useful corrective to such mechanical thinking in the "time on task" literature.

Table 1. Mean Values on Affective and Performance Outcomes by Teacher SES Background and Student Race and Parent's Educational Level

	Lo SES Teachers					Hi SES Teachers				
	Student Race		Student SES			Student Race		Student SES		
	White	Black	<HS	HS	>HS	White	Black	<HS	HS	>HS
Affective Outcomes										
T/P Agree	36.56	31.18	36.35	34.75	27.64	32.08	30.36	30.21	31.47	33.04
	(137)	(146)	(119)	(99)	(65)	(118)	(146)	(112)	(106)	(45)
Climate	16.32	16.37	16.23	16.55	16.30	17.68	13.06	14.13	15.70	16.36
	(152)	(172)	(137)	(102)	(67)	(122)	(159)	(116)	(109)	(45)
T Exp-Read	2.28	2.28	2.08	2.29	2.75	2.65	1.99	2.09	2.54	2.21
	(149)	(151)	(133)	(95)	(57)	(118)	(153)	(112)	(105)	(43)
T Exp-Math	2.49	2.31	2.17	2.43	2.88	2.68	2.01	2.16	2.51	2.21
	(149)	(151)	(133)	(95)	(57)	(118)	(152)	(112)	(105)	(42)
T Exp-Cond.	1.87	1.90	1.86	1.91	1.91	1.93	1.76	1.79	1.90	1.84
	(147)	(151)	(132)	(96)	(57)	(118)	(153)	(112)	(105)	(43)
T-P Mature	1.52	2.60	1.89	1.36	2.52	2.87	-.66	-1.42	3.31	.24
	(136)	(144)	(117)	(93)	(57)	(109)	(142)	(102)	(103)	(41)
Performance Outcomes										
Reading	2.22	2.14	2.02	2.22	2.48	2.63	2.01	2.12	2.44	2.34
	(136)	(156)	(122)	(98)	(59)	(109)	(134)	(98)	(101)	(38)
Math	2.59	2.44	2.34	2.54	2.84	2.82	2.23	2.23	2.66	2.74
	(136)	(156)	(122)	(98)	(97)	(108)	(134)	(98)	(100)	(38)
Conduct	1.79	1.77	1.73	1.81	1.83	1.95	1.65	1.79	1.82	1.74
	(135)	(156)	(121)	(98)	(59)	(109)	(133)	(97)	(101)	(38)
CAT V	329.2	333.7	321.2	336.8	346.0	339.6	322.7	322.2	335.4	335.8
	(144)	(167)	(131)	(101)	(64)	(109)	(153)	(106)	(105)	(42)
CAT Q	316.9	312.1	307.7	317.6	326.1	319.3	303.0	302.9	313.9	315.6
	(143)	(166)	(131)	(100)	(64)	(109)	(153)	(106)	(105)	(42)

Table 2. Regressions Predicting Affective Outcomes, Separately by Teacher SES Background

	Full Sample				Low SES Teachers			High SES Teachers		
	Race	Ped	TSES	R^2	Race	Ped	R^2	Race	Ped	R^2
T/P Agree	-.090*	-.111*		.024	-.112	-.231*	.072	-.065	.062	.014
	(-3.096)	(-.887)		(.015)	(-4.201)	(-1.847)	(.054)	(-1.995)	(.496)	(-.006)
	-.092*	-.118*	-.140*	.044						
	(-3.166)	(-.945)	(-.105)	(.032)						
Climate	-.303*	.128*		.105	-.015	.020	.020	-.486*	.212*	.206
	(-2.323)	(.213)		(.097)	(-.067)	(.020)	(.011)	(-4.056)	(.546)	(.272)
	-.306*	.109*	-.211*	.149						
	(-2.347)	(.196)	(-.035)	(.140)						
T Exp-Read	-.176*	.076*		.294	-.051	.123*	.304	-.289*	.049	.341
	(-.324)	(.032)		(.289)	(-.088)	(.045)	(.294)	(-.564)	(.025)	(.330)
	-.175*	.080*	.065	.298						
	(-.323)	(.039)	(.003)	(.292)						
T Exp-Math	-.198*	.076*		.340	-.085	.147*	.360	-.301*	-.005	.372
	(-.363)	(.032)		(.335)	(-.149)	(.055)	(.350)	(-.575)	(-.003)	(.362)
	-.198*	.077*	.028	.341						
	(-.362)	(.033)	(.001)	(.335)						
T Exp-Cond	-.096*	.039		.074	.038	.028	.060	-.210*	.065	.130
	(-.066)	(.006)		(.065)	(.024)	(.004)	(.043)	(-.158)	(.013)	(.112)
	-.096*	.037	-.036	.075						
	(-.067)	(.006)	(-.000)	(.065)						
T-P Nature	-.032	-.030		.047	.071	-.056	.034	-.101	.013	.104
	(-.742)	(-.162)		(.038)	(1.472)	(-.249)	(.016)	(-2.563)	(.085)	(.085)
	-.033	-.032	-.031	.048						
	(-.753)	(-.171)	(-.016)	(.037)						

Metric coefficients are presented in parentheses. An asterisk indicates significance at the .01 level; a "" indicates significance at the .05 level. The second entry in the R^2 column is the level of explained variance after adjusting for degrees of freedom.

Table 3 Regressions Predicting Fourth Quarter Marks by Teacher SES Background

	Full Sample					Low SES Teachers				Hi SES Teachers			
	Race	Ped	TSES	"Affect"	R2	Race	Ped	"Affect"	R2	Race	Ped	"Affect"	R2
Reading	-.190*	.063			.274	-.090	.101		.259	-.286*	.050		.346
	(-.326)	(.025)			(.269)	(-.144)	(.034)		(.249)	(-.525)	(.024)		(.335)
	-.189*	.069*	.103*		.285	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----
	(-.323)	(.027)	(.004)		(.278)	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----
(T/P Agree)	-.196*	.059	.092*	-.082*	.291	-.101	.079	-.095	.267	-.290*	.054	-.074	.351
	(-.336)	(.023)	(.003)	(-.004)	(.282)	(-.161)	(.027)	(-.004)	(.253)	(-.533)	(.026)	(-.004)	(.337)
(Climate)	-.176*	.064	.113*	.045	.287	-.087	.100	-.138*	.278	-.257*	.037	.059	.348
	(-.301)	(.025)	(.004)	(.010)	(.278)	(-.141)	(.034)	(-.048)	(.266)	(-.472)	(.016)	(.011)	(.334)
(T-P Mature)	-.161*	.016	.111*	.166*	.508	-.146*	.067	.183*	.416	-.174*	-.019	.137*	.537
	(-.276)	(.006)	(.004)	(.012)	(.501)	(-.257)	(.025)	(.016)	(.402)	(-.320)	(-.009)	(.010)	(.525)
(T.Exp)	-.046+	.004	.050	.816*	.752	-.047	-.004	.855*	.768	-.062	.012	.774*	.741
	(-.078)	(.002)	(.012)	(.759)	(.749)	(-.075)	(-.001)	(.786)	(.763)	(-.115)	(.006)	(.728)	(.735)
Math	-.168*	.089+			.291	-.065	.092		.285	-.283*	.095		.340
	(-.310)	(.038)			(.286)	(-.115)	(.034)		(.275)	(-.548)	(.048)		(.329)
	-.168*	.092+	.050		.294	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----
	(-.309)	(.039)	(.002)		(.287)	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----
(T/P Agree)	-.173*	.085+	.042	-.058	.297	-.072	.078	-.067	.290	-.287*	.099	-.055	.343
	(-.319)	(.036)	(.002)	(-.003)	(.288)	(-.127)	(.029)	(-.003)	(.276)	(-.556)	(.049)	(-.003)	(.328)
(Climate)	-.138*	.079+	.071	.098+	.302	-.065	.092	.007	.286	-.256*	.082	.055	.342
	(-.254)	(.034)	(.003)	(.024)	(.294)	(-.114)	(.035)	(.003)	(.273)	(-.496)	(.041)	(.011)	(.328)
(T-P Mature)	-.156*	.053	.055	.143*	.448	-.168*	.049	.196*	.480	-.180*	.039	.093	.489
	(-.287)	(.022)	(.002)	(.012)	(.440)	(-.268)	(.017)	(.015)	(.468)	(-.348)	(.020)	(.007)	(.476)
(T.Exp)	-.022	.035	.029	.736*	.651	-.002	-.017	.745*	.641	-.064	.099+	.728*	.673
	(-.041)	(.015)	(.001)	(.740)	(.647)	(-.003)	(-.007)	(.749)	(.634)	(-.124)	(.049)	(.736)	(.666)

Table 3 continued

	Full Sample					Low SES Teachers				Hi SES Teachers			
	Pace	Ped	SES	"Affect"	R2	Pace	Ped	"Affect"	R2	Pace	Ped	"Affect"	R2
Conduct	-.164*	.009			.096	-.013	.011		.083	-.345*	.021		.178
	(-.135)	(.002)			(.068)	(-.011)	(.002)		(.067)	(-.284)	(.004)		(.160)
	-.163*	.011	.034		.097	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----
	(-.135)	(.002)	(.001)		(.087)	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----
(T/P Agree)	-.169*	.003	.025	-.065	.101	-.022	-.007	-.077	.089	-.349*	.023	-.037	.179
	(-.140)	(.001)	(.001)	(-.002)	(.088)	(-.018)	(-.001)	(-.002)	(.067)	(-.286)	(.005)	(-.001)	(.157)
(Climate)	-.162*	.010	.035	.005	.097	-.015	.016	-.130+	.099	-.346*	.020	.002	.178
	(-.134)	(.002)	(.001)	(.001)	(.085)	(-.013)	(.002)	(-.026)	(.080)	(-.283)	(.004)	(.000)	(.157)
(T-P Mature)	-.150*	-.023	.040	.140*	.273	-.128+	-.035	.111+	.335	-.275*	-.009	.229*	.285
	(-.124)	(-.004)	(.001)	(.005)	(.261)	(-.106)	(-.006)	(.004)	(.318)	(-.226)	(-.002)	(.007)	(.262)
(T.Exp)	-.115*	-.008	.052	.499*	.328	-.033	-.003	.512*	.330	-.247*	-.010	.471*	.371
	(-.095)	(-.002)	(.001)	(.593)	(.318)	(-.027)	(-.001)	(.667)	(.314)	(-.203)	(-.002)	(.516)	(.354)

*Metric coefficients are presented in parentheses. An asterisk indicates significance at the .01 level; a "+" indicates significance at the .05 level. The second entry in the R2 column is the level of explained variance after adjusting for degrees of freedom. The "affect" measure included in a particular equation is identified in parentheses in the first column.

Table 4 Regressions Predicting Spring Test Performance Separately by Teacher SES Background*

	Full Sample					Low SES Teachers				Hi SES Teachers			
	Race	Ped	TSES	"Affect"	R^2	Race	Ped	"Affect"	R^2	Race	Ped	"Affect"	R^2
CAT-V	-.075+	.065			.366	.019	.068		.349	-.171*	.084		.436
	(-5.356)	(1.070)			(.361)	(1.378)	(1.038)		(.340)	(-12.391)	(1.573)		(.427)
	-.074+	.066	.016		.366	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----
	(-5.341)	(1.085)	(.026)		(.360)	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----
(T/P Agree)	-.071+	.070	.022	.037	.368	.024	.078	.043	.351	-.169*	.083	.025	.436
	(-5.102)	(1.160)	(.034)	(.076)	(.360)	(1.716)	(1.187)	(.081)	(.338)	(-12.278)	(1.548)	(.060)	(.425)
(Climate)	-.030	.051	.048	.149*	.385	.018	.069	.072	.354	-.107	.055	.130+	.448
	(-2.154)	(.838)	(.075)	(1.390)	(.378)	(1.313)	(1.041)	(1.125)	(.343)	(-7.770)	(1.038)	(.945)	(.437)
(T-P Mature)	-.051	.027	.024	.180*	.517	-.038	.033	.194*	.481	-.080	.029	.153*	.569
	(-3.659)	(.443)	(.038)	(.560)	(.511)	(-2.720)	(.508)	(.662)	(.469)	(-5.772)	(.552)	(.438)	(.558)
(T.Exp)	.018	.024	-.018	.528*	.562	.046	.005	.516*	.534	-.024	.059	.510*	.607
	(1.303)	(.390)	(-.028)	(20.586)	(.557)	(3.243)	(.077)	(21.130)	(.526)	(-1.720)	(1.105	(18.921)	(.599)
CAT-O	-.129*	.067+			.437	-.036	.050		.437	-.236*	.090		.474
	(-7.811)	(.936)			(.432)	(-2.226)	(.649)		(.429)	(-14.051)	(1.390)		(.466)
	-.130*	.064	-.059		.440	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----
	(-7.862)	(.896)	(-.078)		(.435)	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----
(T/P Agree)	-.127*	.068	-.055	.031	.441	-.032	.059	.039	.438	-.234	.088	.029	.475
	(-7.690)	(.945)	(-.072)	(.055)	(.434)	(-1.968)	(.762)	(.063)	(.427)	(-13.924)	(1.359)	(.056)	(.464)
(Climate)	-.089*	.047	-.031	.135*	.456	-.036	.049	.020	.437	-.154*	.054	.165*	.494
	(-5.377)	(.659)	(-.040)	(1.063)	(.450)	(-2.219)	(.639)	(.263)	(.428)	(-9.179)	(.835)	(.985)	(.484)
(T-P Mature)	-.119*	.044	-.052	.216*	.542	-.099+	.037	.213*	.531	-.167*	.061	.226*	.566
	(-7.189)	(.608)	(-.069)	(.564)	(.536)	(-6.033)	(.484)	(.624)	(.521)	(-9.999)	(.932)	(.531)	(.555)
(T.Exp)	-.055	.035	-.070+	.380*	.535	-.005	-.004	.367*	.523	-.126*	.092+	.363*	.557
	(-3.317)	(.488)	(-.092)	(12.551)	(.530)	(-.328)	(-.055)	(12.740)	(.515)	(-7.538)	(1.420)	(11.319)	(.548)

*Metric coefficients are presented in parentheses. An asterisk indicates significance at the .01 level; a "+" indicates significance at the .05 level. The second entry in the R^2 column is the level of explained variance after adjusting for degrees of freedom. The "affect" measure included in a particular equation is identified in parentheses in the first column.

References

Alexander, K.L. and M.A. Cook. 1982. "Curricula and coursework: Surprise ending to a familiar story." American Sociological Review 47:626-640.

Alexander, K.L. and B.K. Eckland. 1980. "The 'Explorations in Equality of Opportunity' sample of 1955 high school sophomores." Pp. 31-58 in A.C. Kerckhoff (ed.), Research in Sociology of Education and Socialization, V. 1. JAI Press.

Alexander, K.L., D.R. Entwisle, D. Cadigan and A.M. Pallas. 1985. Getting Started in School: Teachers and First Grade Achievement. Unpublished manuscript.

Alexander, K.L., C. Riordan, J. Fennessey and A.M. Pallas. 1982. "Social background, academic resources, and college graduation: Recent evidence from the National Longitudinal Study." American Journal of Education 90:315-333.

Alwin, D.F. and A. Thornton. 1984. "Family origins and the schooling process: Early versus late influence of parental characteristics." American Sociological Review 49:784-802.

Barber, J.A. jr. 1970. Social Mobility and Voting Behavior. Rand McNally.

Barr, R. and R. Dreeben. 1983. How Schools Work. The University of Chicago Press.

Berger, J., B. Cohen and M. Zelditch. 1972. "Status characteristics and social interaction." American Sociological Review 37:241-255.

Bossert, S.T. 1979. Tasks and Social Relationships in Classrooms. Cambridge University Press.

Bourdieu, P. 1977. Reproduction in Education, Society, and Culture. Sage.

Bowles, S. and H. Gintis. 1976. Schooling in Capitalist America. Basic Books.

Brookover, W.B., J. Schweitzer, C.B. Schneider, P.K. Flood and J. Wisenbaker. 1978. "Elementary school social climate and school achievement." American Education Research Journal 15:301-318.

Brophy, J.E. and T.L. Good. 1974. Teacher-Student Relationships: Causes and Consequences. Holt.

Brown, B.W. and D.H. Saks. 1975. "The production and distribution of cognitive skills within schools." Journal of Political Economy 83:571-593.

Coleman, J.S., E.Q. Campbell, C.J. Hobson, J. McPartland, A. Mood, F.D. Weinfield and R.L. York. 1966. Equality of Educational Opportunity. U.S. Government Printing Office.

Davis, S.A. and E.J. Haller. 1981. "Tracking, ability and SES: Further evidence on the 'Revisionist-Meritocratic' debate." American Journal of Education 89:283-303.

DiMaggio, P. 1982. "Cultural capital and school success: The impact of status culture participation on the grades of U.S. high school students." American Sociological Review 47:189-201.

Dusek, J.B. 1975. "Do teachers bias children's learning?" Review of Educational Research 45:661-684.

Elashoff, J.D. and R.E. Snow. 1971. Pygmalion Reconsidered. Jones Publishing Co.

Entwisle, D.R. and L.A. Hayduk. 1982. Early Schooling: Cognitive and Affective Outcomes. Johns Hopkins Press.

Epstein, J.L. 1983. "Longitudinal effects of person-family-school interactions on student outcomes." In A. Kerckhoff (ed.), Research in Sociology of Education and Socialization: Vol. 4. JAI Press.

Epstein, J.L. and J.M. McPartland. 1977. "Family and school interactions and main effects on affective outcomes." Report No. 235. Baltimore, MD: Center for Social Organization of Schools.

Hauser, R.M. 1970. "Educational stratification in the United States." Pp. 102-129 in E.O. Laumann (ed.), Social Stratification: Research and Theory for the 1970s. Bobbs-Merrill.

Heyns, B. 1978. Summer Learning and the Effects of Schooling. Academic Press.

Karweit, N. 1985. "Should we lengthen the school term?" Educational Researcher 14:9-15.

Kedar-Voivodas, G. 1983. "The impact of elementary children's roles and sex roles on teacher attitudes: An interactional analysis." Review of Educational Research 53:414-437.

Hope, K. 1975. "Models of status inconsistency and social mobility effects." American Sociological Review 40:322-343.

Leiter, J. and J.S. Brown. 1985. "Determinants of elementary school grading." Sociology of Education 58:166-180.

Levin, H.M. 1980. "Educational production theory and teacher inputs." Pp. 203-231 in C.E. Bidwell and D.M. Windham (eds.), The Analysis of Educational Productivity, Volume II: Issues in Macroanalysis. Ballenger.

Lopreato, J. 1967. "Upward social mobility and political orientation." American Sociological Review 32:586-592.

Lortie, D.C. 1975. Schoolteacher. Chicago.

McDill, E.L. and L.C. Rigsby. 1973. Structure and Process in Secondary Schools: The Impact of Educational Climates. Johns Hopkins Press.

Pedersen, E., T.A. Faucher and W.W. Eaton. 1978. "A new perspective on the effects of first-grade teachers on children's subsequent adult status." Harvard Educational Review 48:1-31.

Rehberg, R.A. and E.R. Rosenthal. 1978. Class and Merit in the American High School. Longman.

Rist, R.C. 1970. "Student social class and teacher expectations: The self-fulfilling prophecy in ghetto education." Harvard Educational Review 40:411-451.

Rist, R.C. 1973. The Urban School: A Factory for Failure. MIT Press.

Rosenthal, R. and J. Jacobson. 1968. Pygmalion in the Classroom. Holt.

Rutter, M., B. Maughan, P. Mortimore and J. Ouston. 1979. Fifteen Thousand Hours: Secondary Schools and Their Effects on Children. Harvard University Press.

St. John, N. 1971. "Thirty-six teachers: Their characteristics and outcomes for black and white pupils." American Educational Research Journal 8:635-648.

Sarbin, T.R. and V.L. Allen. 1968. "Role theory." Pp. 488-567 in G. Lindzey and E. Aronson (eds.), The Handbook of Social Psychology, Second Edition, Volume 1. Addison-Wesley.

Sewell, W.H. and R.M. Hauser. 1980. "The Wisconsin longitudinal study of social and psychological factors in aspirations and achievements." Pp. 59-100 in A.C. Kerckhoff (ed.), Research in Sociology of Education and Socialization, V. 1. JAI Press.

Smith, M.S. 1972. "Equality of educational opportunity: The basic findings reconsidered." Pp. 230-342 in F. Mosteller and D.P. Moynihan (eds.), On Equality of Educational Opportunity. Vintage Books.

Summers, A.A. and B.L. Wolfe. 1977. "Do schools make a difference?" American Economic Review 65:639-652.

Thompson, K.H. 1971. Upward mobility and political orientation." American Sociological Review 36:223-235.

Williams, T. 1976. "Teacher prophecies and the inheritance of inequality." Sociology of Education 49:223-236.